



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/708,797	11/07/2000	Andreas Schilling	18235-04726	2506

7590 02/14/2003  
Susan Yee  
DARR & FERRELL  
2225 E. Bayshore Road  
Suite 200  
Palo Alto, CA 94303

EXAMINER

HAVAN, THU THAO

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2672

DATE MAILED: 02/14/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

h

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/708,797

Applicant(s)

SCHILLING ET AL.

Examiner

Thu-Thao Havan

Art Unit

2672

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 November 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 58-73 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 58-73 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.  
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).  
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 3. 6) ☐ Other:

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Drawings*

1. This application has been filed with informal drawings which are acceptable for examination purposes only. Formal drawings will be required when the application is allowed.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) do not apply to the examination of this application as the application being examined was not (1) filed on or after November 29, 2000, or (2) voluntarily published under 35 U.S.C. 122(b). Therefore, this application is examined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

3. Claims **58-66 and 71-73** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being unpatentable by non-patent literature, Williams, L., "Pyramidal Parametrics", (hereinafter as Williams).

Re claim **58**, Williams discloses a method for mapping a texture onto a surface of a computer generated object comprising the steps of approximating a true pixel color by

performing a number of texturing operations, texture operations being determined by a geometric shape of a projection of a pixel on the texture (pages 1-3); and averaging results of texturing operations (page 2; fig. 1). In other words, Williams teaches texture mapping of images onto surfaces to increase the realism and information content of computer-generated imagery. For example, he teaches the projection of a flat surface image onto a curved surface. The image is separated into its red, green, and blue component. Thus, a true pixel color is generated with his parametric interpolation. As for averaging results of texturing operation, Williams teaches each of the images is averaged down from its larger predecessor.

Re claim **59**, Williams teaches accessing a mipmap at least one time and responding to multiple accesses being performed by, interpolating results of the accesses (page 2). In other words, parametric interpolation of Williams addresses this claimed limitations.

Re claim **60**, Williams teaches texturing operations is a power of two (page 2, 5<sup>th</sup> paragraph; page 3, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph). Williams teaches the samplings are performed at scales which are powers of two.

Re claim **61**, Williams teaches texturing operations is less than or equal to a predetermined limit (page 2; fig. 1). In figure 1, Williams teaches the structure of a color mipmap wherein each of the images is averaged down from its larger predecessor.

Re claim **62**, Williams teaches texture represents a reflected environment (page 7, 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph; figs. 13-14). In other words, Williams teaches the shading function depends not only the shape of the surface, but its light reflection properties.

Re claims **63-66 and 72**, Williams teaches modifying a specularly reflected light intensity on a surface of a computer generated object (page 7, 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph; figs. 13-14), comprising combining the specularly reflected light intensity with a specular reflectance coefficient, specular reflectance coefficient being retrieved from a specular reflectance coefficient map associated with the surface (pages 7-8).

Re claim **71**, the limitations of claim 71 are identical to claim 58 above except for an electronically-readable medium storing a program for permitting a computer to perform. Therefore, claim 71 is treated the same as discussed with respect to claim 58 above. Williams' teaching is a computer software system with image storage and transmission may permit significant compression of the data to be stored or transmitted (page 1). It is apparent that a program is stored on an electronically-readable medium.

Re claim **73**, Williams teaches an electronically-readable medium storing a program for permitting computer to perform a method for adding detail to a texture map comprising at least one texture element, the method comprising generating a detail map (page 9); assigning a pointer (page 2; index correspond to pointer) into detail map to at least one of the texture elements of the texture map to generate a pointer map, pointer comprising two offsets including a first offset stored in a first offset map and a second offset stored in a second offset map (pages 2-3); interpolating detail color based on the generated detail map (page 3); interpolating texture color based on the texture map; and combining detail color with texture color to generate a pixel color (pages 3 and 7-8).

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim **67-70** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over non-patent literature, Williams, L., "Pyramidal Parametrics", (hereinafter as Williams) and further in view of Cosman (US patent 5,651,104).

Re claim **67**, Williams teaches a texturing unit for mapping a texture to a surface of a computer generated object, which texture comprises a mipmap, which mipmap comprises a plurality of levels, each of which levels comprises at least one texel (pages 1-3), the texturing unit comprising a control unit for receiving an input signal and determining a set of N footprint texel locations and at least one footprint level of detail from the input signal, which input signal includes information about a location and a shape of a projection of a pixel on the texture (pages 8-9—levels of detail in surface representation and dividing the surface up into regions of relatively low curvature of Williams discloses this limitation); an interpolator (page 2- parametric interpolation of Williams addresses this); and an averaging unit (page 2; fig. 1-- each of the images is averaged down from its larger predecessor). —

Williams *fails* to specifically disclose a Random Access Memory (RAM) and an output port. However, Cosman teaches a Random Access Memory (RAM) in a computer graphics system using supersampling of multi-level pixel characteristic data (col. 9, lines 10-50). As for an output port, Cosman teaches a display unit. A display

Art Unit: 2672

unit is a type of output port because it output information for the users. It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to combine a Random Access Memory (RAM) and an output port of Cosman to the system of Williams because it would have enable an image generator to store texture mapping information in a RAM and output the information in a display unit (Cosman col. 9, lines 10-50).

Re claims **68-69**, these limitations are being treated with the same grounds of rejection as claim 67 above.

Re claim **70**, Williams teaches mipmap generation unit calculates each level of the generated mipmap incrementally based on available information from the next level of higher detail (pages 2 and 8-9; figs. 1 and 20-23). In figures 1 and 20-23, Williams teaches mipmap generation wherein the interpolation of each images is averaged down from its larger predecessor.

### ***Conclusion***

4. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Chelstowski et al., US patent no. 5,461,712

Tarolli et al., US Patent No. 5,831,624

### ***Inquiries***

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thu-Thao Havan whose telephone number is (703) 308-7062. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Thursday from 9:00-5:00.

Art Unit: 2672

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Razavi can be reached on (703) 305-4713.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231


or faxed to:

(703) 872-9314 (for Technology Center 2600 only)

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA, Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Technology Center 2600 Customer Service Office whose telephone number is (703) 306-0377.

Thu-Thao Havan  
Art Unit: 2672  
February 6, 2003



**MICHAEL RAZAVI**  
**SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER**  
**TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600**